REMARKS

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Official Action dated July 21, 2004 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-11 have been amended. Claims 12-14 have been added. Claims 1-14 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,122,840 (hereinafter "*Chbat*"). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." The Applicant respectfully submits that *Chbat* does not teach every element recited in claim 1. Therefore, *Chbat* cannot anticipate claims 1 and 2. To further illustrate, claim 1 has been amended recite a laundry dryer comprising, among other features, "a microcomputer for controlling a plurality of drivers associated with a heater, motor and exhaust fan according to the sensed temperature signal from said temperature sensor, wherein said microcomputer stops the heater, thereby initiating a cooling procedure." *Chbat* does not teach a microcomputer which terminates a heater to initiate cooling. In contrast, *Chbat* teaches a signal processor 46 that determines a difference between temperatures sensed by a first temperature sensor 42 and a second temperature sensor 44. The signal processor 46 of *Chbat* also identifies a mean temperature difference value which is used to generate a clothes load estimate signal for clothes in the dryer. See col. 5, lines 29-36. As such, the Applicant respectfully submits that *Chbat* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 1, as required under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claim 2, which depends from claim 1, is also patentable over *Chbat* for at least the same reason.

The Office Action also rejected claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,245,764 to *Sung* (hereinafter "*Sung*"). The rejection is traversed.

The Applicant submits that *Sung* does not disclose each and every element recited in claim 9. Thus, *Sung* cannot anticipate claim 9. Specifically, claims 9 recites a method for controlling a laundry dryer including, among other novel features, "comparing the sensed internal temperature with a predetermined temperature value; and stopping said cooling procedure step if the sensed temperature is lower than a predetermined temperature." Contrary to what is alleged in the Office Action, *Sung* does not disclose these features. In particular, the Office Action references col. 6, lines 37-51 in alleging that *Sung* teaches the feature of comparing a sensed internal temperature with a predetermined temperature value. *Sung* teaches that a temperature difference Tα is determined between a sensed internal temperature T1 of a dryer 5 and a sensed exhaust air temperature T2. See col. 6, lines 10-13. In addition, *Sung* teaches that the temperature difference Tα varies depending on a room air temperature. See col. 6, lines 37-51. *Sung* does not teach comparing a sensed internal temperature with a predetermined temperature value.

The Office Action references col. 6, lines 22-36 in alleging that *Sung* discloses the feature of stopping a cooling procedure step if a sensed temperature is lower than a predetermined temperature. *Sung* does not disclose this feature. Instead, *Sung* discloses that when the internal temperature of the drum 5 reaches a certain temperature and held constant, thermal energy from heaters is completely consumed as evaporation heat for drying clothes in the drum 5. As such, according to *Sung*, the temperature difference between the sensed internal temperature and the sensed exhaust air temperature remains the same. See col. 6, lines 22-30. The Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does *Sung* disclose stopping a cooling

procedure step if a sensed temperature is lower than a predetermined temperature. Furthermore, holding a temperature constant, as taught in *Sung*, is counter to cooling. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that *Sung* fails to disclose each and every element recited in claim 9, as required under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claim 11, which depends from claim 9, is also patentable over *Sung* for at least the same reason.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claims 3-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chbat* in view of *Sung*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." The Applicant respectfully submits that neither *Chbat* nor *Sung*, either singularly or in combination, disclose each and every element recited in claims 3-8. As discussed above, *Chbat* does not disclose each and every element recited in claim 1, the base claim from which claims 3-8 depend. Furthermore, *Sung* fails to overcome the previously noted shortcomings of *Chbat*, namely a laundry dryer having a microcomputer for controlling a plurality of drivers associated a heater, motor and exhaust fan according to a sensed temperature from said temperature sensor where the microcomputer terminates the heater to initiate the cooling. Thus, neither *Chbat* nor *Sung*, either singularly or in combination, disclose each and every element recited in claims 3-8, as required under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 3-8 are patentable over *Chbat* in view of *Sung* and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

In addition, the Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sung*. As previously discussed, *Sung* does not disclose each and every feature recited in claim 9, from which claim 10 depends. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 10 is also patentable over *Sung* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Applicant believes that the application is in a condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: October 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Mark R. Kresloff
Registration No.: 42,766
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006

Attorney for Applicant